Case 1:18-cr-00654-KAM Document 97 Filed 10/05/21 Page 1 of 45 PageID #: 730

_	(in open court.)
2	THE COURT: Counsel and Mr. Woodford are present.
3	This is a sentencing in the case of United States V. Darrell
4	Woodford, 18-CR-654.
5	Will the Government please state your appearance.
6	MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Temidayo Aganga-Williams.
7	THE COURT: Good morning.
8	MS. GLASHAUSSER: Allegra Glashausser representing
9	Mr. Woodford, who is here with me.
10	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Woodford.
11	THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Sir, do you speak and understand
13	English?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Raise your right hand and take an oath
16	to tell the truth.
17	(Defendant sworn.)
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
19	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
20	Mr. Woodford, as you can see we have a court
21	reporter who is going to be making a transcript of today's
22	sentencing proceedings. The transcript will be made part of
23	any appeal that you may wish to take.
24	I reviewed the Indictment, ECF number seven, the
25	transcript of Mr. Woodford's January 10, 2020 guilty plea, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

January 10, 2020, plea agreement, the executed preliminary order of forfeiture, which is document number 75 and will be made part of this judgment, the February 11, 2020 presentence report, which is ECF 74, the February 11 Probation Department sentencing recommendation, which is ECF 74-1, and Mr. Woodford's objections to the PSR, ECF 77. I've also reviewed defense counsel's submissions dated February 18, 2020 and April 23, 2021. As well as letters from Mr. Woodford's family members and other supporters. Finally, I've reviewed the Government's sentencing memorandum, which is ECF number 78. Have I overlooked any submissions? MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: I don't believe so, your Honor. MS. GLASHAUSSER: No, your Honor. Only there was an extra family letter that was submitted at a different date, perhaps that was included. THE COURT: Yes. We reviewed family letters. you. I would like to confirm that Mr. Woodford is a United States citizen so we need not address ICE notification or consular notification? MS. GLASHAUSSER: That's correct, your Honor.

> Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

THE COURT: Thank you.

1 Mr. Woodford, are you satisfied with your attorney 2 Allegra Glashausser? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Ms. Glashausser, are there any 5 unresolved conflicts, motions or any other matters that we 6 should address before we proceed with our sentencing? 7 MS. GLASHAUSSER: No, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Woodford does appear to be alert and 9 following these proceedings closely. 10 Do you agree with that observation, Ms. Glashausser? 11 MS. GLASHAUSSER: Yes, your Honor. 12 Do you know of any reason why we should THE COURT: 13 not proceed with Mr. Woodford's sentencing today? 14 MS. GLASHAUSSER: No, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: I'd like to confirm that the Government 16 has not as of this date identified any victims who would 17 otherwise be entitled to restitution? 18 MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: That's correct, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Have you given any victims the notice of 20 today's sentencing proceeding? 21 MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor, in the normal 22 process. 23 THE COURT: My understanding is that victim impact 24 statement letters were sent to any purported victims but they 25 did not respond, is that still the status?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Under normal circumstances if the victims submitted affidavits of loss, I would be in a position to award restitution for the injuries that they suffered. But I will not do so because we have not identified the victim. Mr. Woodford, have you read the presentence report and all the sentencing submissions by the Government, your lawyer and probation? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Did you have any trouble understanding those submissions? THE DEFENDANT: No. Did you have a full opportunity to THE COURT: discuss the submissions with your lawyer? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Are you ready now to be sentenced? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Sir, you may recall that on January 10, 2020, you entered a plea of guilty before me. At that hearing you were placed under oath and asked questions about your understanding of the charge to which you pled quilty, your rights, the consequences of a quilty plea to the charge, and other matters. In addition, I did ask you what you did in connection with the charge in the Indictment. Were your

answers to my questions truthful, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I've confirmed that the statements that

Mr. Woodford made were knowing and voluntary, and based upon a

full understanding of his rights and that he did establish

facts to support his guilty plea to the count in the

Indictment, and I did previously accept his guilty plea but I

did reconfirm that. I accepted Mr. Woodford's guilty plea to

the sole count of the Indictment, which charges that on

August 30, 2018, Mr. Woodford, having previously been

convicted in a Court of one or more crimes punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding one year knowingly and intentionally possessed in and affecting commerce three Remington Peters .38 automatic caliber cartridge casings in violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 922(q)(1).

Mr. Woodford, you have a right to have what is called a Fatico fact finding hearing, which is a hearing during which parties may present evidence either in dispute and/or relevant to sentencing. Would you like to have such a hearing?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: In addition, sir, you have the right to be heard today in court. If you would like to make a statement I'm happy to hear from you. Would you like to make a statement, sir?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 All right, please just keep your voice THE COURT: 3 up if you don't mind. 4 THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, your Honor, I'm kind of 5 nervous. 6 THE COURT: That's all right, I understand. 7 THE DEFENDANT: I never really spoke before. 8 couple of years I would have never even said nothing. 9 have just said I'm sorry and that was it. I never even 10 thought that no one would care what I have to say. 11 I want to let you know that I'm changing and I'm 12 I'm at a new stage in life. And I apologize to different. 13 the victim and his family. I apologize to my family. I 14 apologize for the selfishness of my actions. 15 Thank you for letting me speak. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Woodford. I have read 17 your lawyer's submissions. It appears that you are taking 18 very serious steps toward putting your life back on track. I 19 also think that your attorney has conveyed a recognition on 20 your part about the life that you led that led you here to the 21 Court, and that you are determined to change direction because 22 of all of the people who support and love you. 23 appreciate hearing that. 24 Ms. Glashausser, I'm also happy to hear from you if 25 you would like to be heard.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, I really had the pleasure of getting to watch Darrell mature over the past three years.

Now I know a smart young man who reads the daily news, discusses current events, and is curious about the world and his place in it. Now I know a man who is focused on his future, who has tried to taking the GED the entire three years he's been at the MDC and keeps asking for the opportunity to take the exam, even though he's never been given it. Now I know a man who gets along well with all sorts of people. The guards and the other incarcerated people at MDC like him. Half of my office knows him. He is someone who listens and respects other people.

These qualities aren't ones that I knew about

Darrell when I first met him about three years ago. Three

years ago Darrell shot someone and was arrested. Now he's

able to reflect on the harm that he caused.

Where he grew up shootings were common. A friend of his was killed when he was 14. He thought he needed a gun to protect himself. Three years ago his life was only about surviving. Now he knows it isn't.

Three years ago he hadn't even started to move past the traumas in his life, his mother dying when he was only five, and him finding her. His father, who he looked up to, being sent to prison. And then going to live with a

grandfather who stole Darrell's money to use drugs.

Now, he has started the work of moving past those traumas so he can learn from the traumas he experienced and the traumas he caused and prevent them going forward.

Three years ago he was only a teenager, 18 years old. Now he's a young man. Science tells us that young people have a huge capacity to change and mature and grow because their brains are still growing. And Darrell is demonstrating that. I've had the chance to watch that happen.

then is a serious reason to sentence him below the guideline. He has shown this maturity and growth despite being at MDC in probably the harshest conditions that you could experience there. When the power went out in the winter of 2019, that seemed like the bottom. It was freezing, there was no heat, no blankets. He was a teenager in an adult jail for the first time. He was the first client I went to visit when visits finally opened. His hands were freezing. That seemed really bad.

But then Covid happened, and as your Honor knows,

Darrell was due to be sentenced the day New York City shut

down. Instead, for over a year he was locked down at MDC. He

showered rarely, talked to family infrequently, and had no

visits.

And then he got sick. When he got sick the lockdown

became even worse. It was as if he was punished for being sick.

Other judges have described the conditions during Covid at MDC as inhumane, extraordinarily harsh like solitary confinement.

The time that he has spent at MDC already has provided a huge amount of just punishment and deterrence and should be counted as longer because of how harsh it was and how extreme.

Despite this, he has continued to mature. He's been working as an orderly. He got that job I think during the pandemic, which is the best job as my clients tell me. It's given to the people that the guards trust at MDC. He has spent a lot of his time writing music lyrics. He's a gifted musician. I suspect that's one reason he's been able to stay mentally strong during such extreme difficulty.

Now I know, your Honor, is aware of his criminal history, which is reflected in his guidelines. This case has been different. It's his first adult sentence. His criminal history is from when he was really a kid, 15. Being among grown men at the jail has helped him grow. It's helped him realize who he does not want to be in the future. He does not want to be a person that is in jail through much of his life.

I also know that, your Honor, has seen the video of the crime and described it as chilling. And there is no

denying that it was a serious crime and a terrible thing to do. Mr. Woodford knows that. He knows that and he's trying to move forward from that, which is exactly what we would hope he would do.

It was not something that he had planned to do. It was something that happened in the heat of the moment. And at that time he thought, as he wrote in his letter, if he didn't do it someone would do it to him. He thought that was normal. He doesn't anymore.

These aren't excuses, none of these are excuses.

Darrell takes full responsibility for what happened. But they explain why it happened why it won't happen again.

As his aunt who basically raised him, Deanna, who is here today, even though she's only six years older than him.

In her letter she wrote: This is something he did but it is not who he is. She said: We can't give up on him.

That's really what I'm urging your Honor to do, is to not give up on Darrell. To see that he has a bright future and to sentence him below the guidelines.

THE COURT: Thank you. Sir, would you like to be heard on behalf of the Government?

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. Just to respond to a few points.

I won't recount the details. I think your Honor is well aware that what happened here was an attempted murder.

It was not out of self-defense. I think defense counsel mentioned the gun for protection, but as your Honor knows in the video, this was not a case of self-defense. It was a case of hunting someone down, chasing them, and trying to kill them in public. That's what happened here, an attempted murder.

There was a mention of a first-adult sentence. But your Honor, it wasn't an adult crime. Mr. Woodford was an adult when he committed this crime and he tried to kill someone.

With regard to the Covid, to the difficulties at MDC in the last few years. The Government does not take an objection to the Court taking that into account in its sentence. I think that would be appropriate here, your Honor.

As you know the Government has asked for a guideline line sentence of 78 to 97 months. And I do think the Court should take into account that the time at MDC over the last few years has been more difficult than anyone would have expected. With that said, your Honor, I think your Honor can both do that; take into account those difficulties while imposing a punishment that acknowledges that this is not a normal felon in possession case. This is not the kind of case we typically see, perhaps where a paroled finds a gun, someone has a criminal history, and then they get a sentence that often does not look like these kind of guidelines. It looks perhaps like something we might see in the 24-month range or

30-something-month range. This is a different kind of case.

Even taking the claims of revocation at face value and believing in those; nonetheless, there is a need for, certainly for general deterrence here, an attempted murder on Brooklyn streets, but also for specific deterrence in that this is not Mr. Woodford's first criminal encounter.

I understand that there are hopes, and that the Government shares in those hopes, that this will be his last encounter with law enforcement but what happened happened, your Honor. And a crime at that level of seriousness the Government respectfully submits that it's important for the Court to impose a punishment that reflects that level of seriousness, which here your Honor was attempted murder in broad daylight.

As I said, your Honor, it would be appropriate for the Court to perhaps go slightly lower than the guidelines the Government initially indicated in its recent letter, while imposing a sentence that acknowledges the seriousness of this offense. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Glashausser, did you want a chance to respond?

MS. GLASHAUSSER: No. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Woodford, I note that
Ms. Glashausser mentioned that your aunt was here in support
and I've also read the letters from your family members. I

understand that your childhood was a very difficult one. And I think that one of the observations that Ms. Glashausser made is that your family members, your younger siblings, are motivating you to be someone who is setting an example and putting your life on the right track. And you mentioned taking care of your grandmother and your younger siblings, and I do hope that your commitment to changing the course of your life will continue.

Your youth does factor into this. There is data that younger people are often recidivists, but I think what you've done here is try to avail yourself of opportunities within the MDC, as limited as they may be, to try to improve and to put yourself in a position to be a law abiding person when you are released. I am encouraged. I hope that your words about feeling regret and sorrow toward your victim are genuine.

The video of the shooting of that young man and the firing of the gun in an open plaza where other bystanders were walking, was very horrific to watch. And I accept that you recognize that and will turn away from that kind of life and that kind of conduct.

I do note that it appears, based on the record, that you were released from the state sentence only a few months before, and then reconnected with some friends who had a beef with another group. And I think the prosecutor accurately

describes your conduct, that you had an encounter, it was an encounter between the two groups. Then you pursued this person through the streets, through several blocks, through a public courtyard where there were people, firing at him. And once he was hit with the first few gunshots, you came back, not once but twice, to fire at close range. And that miraculously he survived but. I'm sure that incident is something he can't just put behind him. An injury like that is life-changing. Even assuming he heals from physical wounds, the psychic wounds of being shot multiple times at close range cannot being understated.

In any event, sir, I am encouraged and I understand that the conditions at MDC since your incarceration have been inhumane and harsh. And I will take that into consideration in deciding your sentence.

Now Mr. Woodford has made some objections to the PSR. First, page one, paragraph eight and 53.

Ms. Glashausser notes that Mr. Woodford was arrested by the FBI on November 21, 2018, not November 23. November 23 was the date that Mr. Woodford was arraigned. And Mr. Woodford had been in custody since September 14, 2018, for a local parole violation. He was in custody since November 21, 2018, not November 23. So I will direct that the PSR be corrected to reflect the correct dates for Mr. Woodford's arrest, arraignment and confinement, both by the NYPD and the FBI when

he was placed in federal custody on November 21, 2018.

Paragraphs 8 and 42, have drawn an objection to the following statement: The arresting agents advised that the defendant is a member of the 8 Trey Cowboy Crips, a street gang.

Mr. Woodford is presumably concerned that this statement intimates that he is a gang member or gang affiliated. The Government notes that at Mr. Woodford's state court sentencing, the prosecutors argued for a sufficient sentence based on Mr. Woodford's affiliation with a gang.

I've not factored in any purported affiliation with the 8 Trey Cowboy Crips into my sentencing analysis. This is an issue that has not been proven.

And I would note, though, that the video suggests that he was with a group of people who had, as I a said, a violent dispute with another group. If the parties would like a Fatico hearing on this issue I'll be happy to hold one.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: We're not asking for a Fatico hearing, your Honor. However, as your Honor noted that it has not been proved, that's why I'm asking for it to be removed from the PSR. Because it does affect where he'll be placed within the BOP system. It changes the points that he gets in the BOP system. I would ask that, your Honor —

THE COURT: I think what I could do is amend paragraphs eight and 42 to leave the statement in: That the

agents advised that he is affiliated with this gang but that he disputes it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Otherwise, we can have a hearing and I can make a finding of fact on this.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: We're not asking for a hearing, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I'll amend paragraphs eight and 42 to provide that Mr. Woodford disputes that he is a member of the 8 Trey Cowboy Crips.

Ms. Glashausser also objects to the statement that Mr. Woodford allocuted with respect to a 2016 state court robbery conviction that he was, quote, "putting guns up to the victims and threatening to shoot them." Defense counsel believes this quote derives from the state prosecutor's characterization of Mr. Woodford's conduct in his 2017 state court sentencing for a robbery conviction. Defense counsel asserts that Mr. Woodford generally allocuted that a co-defendant possessed an apparent weapon. The Government maintains that Mr. Woodford allocuted to putting guns up to the victims and threatening to shoot them, and even recalled putting a gun to one victim's head and threatening to shoot The Government was informed by the Assistant District Attorney who prosecuted Mr. Woodford that he indeed allocuted to this conduct. The Government has not yet received or provided a transcript of Mr. Woodford's quilty plea and

allocution dated September 8, 2016, but refers the Court to the description of Mr. Woodford's allocution in the 2017 state court sentencing minutes.

How do the parties wish to resolve this? Did you get the transcript, Mr. Aganga-Williams?

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: The information we have remains the same.

THE COURT: Ms. Glashausser, do you want to be heard on how to resolve this dispute?

MS. GLASHAUSSER: No, your Honor. I would more generally ask your Honor not to take into consideration the state prosecutor's comments at sentencing from a case --

THE COURT: The dispute is whether or not

Mr. Woodford said these words and admitted he did this; or
whether the prosecutor described it.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: Correct, your Honor, we don't have information that Woodford did say those words, that's why I would ask to strike it.

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Perhaps, your Honor, it should be revised to indicate that the according to the relevant prosecutor he allocuted. That's how we address concerns.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: Perhaps it could just say that the prosecutor said that he did this. It's just that a plea allocution is a legal -- it has specific legal meaning. So I would just worry about having it in a PSR, which also can

follow someone when we don't know if he's correct. I don't think it is a large point, however.

THE COURT: All right, well, I will amend these paragraphs to say -- paragraph 25 -- that the prosecutor described Mr. Woodford's conduct as having put guns up to the victims and threatened to shoot them.

In addition there is a notation that Ms. Glashausser challenges that Mr. Woodford's 2018 parole violation was not stayed but rather was revoked and restored.

Paragraphs 31 to 33, Ms. Glashausser challenges or clarifies that Mr. Woodford's arrests reported in 31 to 33 are related to his 2016 conviction. In addition, the reported date of his offense, July 7, 1995, is incorrect as defendant was not yet born.

I will note that this is an erroneous date. And that the arrest in paragraphs 31 to 33 is related to his 2016 conviction.

Paragraphs 36, 41, and 51, defense counsel requests that the PSR should be amended to reflect that Mr. Woodford's father's first name is Darell, that Mr. Woodford lived in Buffalo for approximately one year, and that Mr. Woodford left the 11th grade because of a local arrest.

There is no objection, and we will make those corrections to the PSR, paragraphs 36, 41 and 51.

Paragraph 54, defense counsel explains that

Mr. Woodford did not receive a regular salary for his work as a rapper. And reported during his presentence report interview that he earned between \$1,000 and \$2,000 periodically. And toward the end of this employment received between \$6,000 and \$8,000 every couple of weeks. Absent the Government's objection, I'll instruct probation to amend the PSR accordingly.

Paragraphs 30, 59, 75. Defense counsel objects to the PSR listing Mr. Woodford's obligation to pay taxes in 2018 under other criminal conduct. Defense counsel asserts that Mr. Woodford's tax obligations should not be considered against him under other criminal conduct because it is not entirely clear that he was required to file taxes for his employment NuLa Entertainment, and he was incarcerated at MDC during the tax reporting period. In any event, the Court has not considered Mr. Woodford's fulfillment of his tax obligations in reaching a sentencing decision.

For a violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 922(g)(1) the PSR calculated Mr. Woodford's advisory adjusted offense level as 29. Three points were deducted for acceptance of responsibility, leaving a total offense level of 26. The PSR calculated Mr. Woodford's criminal history category as three, which results in a sentencing range between 78 to 97 months.

Are there any other findings of fact or law that the defense or Government wish me to make?

1 MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Not from the Government, your 2 Honor. 3 MS. GLASHAUSSER: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: I have independently given respectful 5 consideration to the 2018 sentencing guidelines in calculating 6 Mr. Woodford's sentence. 7 First, for a violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 8 922(q)(1), a felon in possession of ammunition, I considered 9 quideline 2K2.1(c)(1)(A), which cross-references Section 2X1.1 10 because the defendant used the ammunition cited in the offense 11 of conviction in connection with an attempted murder. He 12 stipulated to this in his plea agreements. 2X1.1(c)(1) 13 further instructs that when an attempt is expressly covered by 14 another offense quideleine section, the Court should apply the 15 guideline section. Attempted murder is covered by guideline 16 Section 2A2.1, which provides a base offense level under 17 2A2.1(a)(2) of 27. 18 Because the victim suffered serious injuries as a 19 result of the offense, quideline 2A2.1(b)(1)(B) militates for

a two-level enhancement.

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Mr. Woodford did demonstrate acceptance of responsibility by pleading guilty and sparing the Government the need to prepare for trial. He's given three points off for acceptance for responsibility, leaving a total offense level of 26.

Mr. Woodford has a prior conviction and at least two prior arrests, in November 18, 2015 and November 23, 2016. Of the prior conviction results in five criminal history points.

On November 18, 2015, at age 15 Mr. Woodford was arrested for robbery in the second degree. He committed five robberies over two weekend nights in November 2015 targeting 11 victims. According to the Government, as well as the prosecutor at Mr. Woodford's 2017 state court sentencing for the robbery offense, Mr. Woodford allocuted to putting guns to the victims' heads and threatening to shoot them. However, we'll note there is a dispute about whether he said it or whether the Government described him saying it.

Although Mr. Woodford possessed a gun and ammunition, the gun was apparently a replica.

Defendant pled guilty on September 8, 2016. And on January 6, 2017, he was sentenced in New York County Supreme Court Criminal Term to 28 months to seven years custody.

He was released on parole on May 29, 2018. And his parole was revoked less than five months later after the instant offense in August 2018. Mr. Woodford's 2016 robbery conviction generates three criminal history points.

Because Mr. Woodford committed the instant offense while under a criminal justice sentence, that is the state court parole specifically for robbery in the second degree, quideline 4A1.1(d) provides that two points are added to

Mr. Woodford's criminal history.

The PSR further states that defendant has not filed personal income tax returns. But I am not going to add any criminal history points related to this or consider it otherwise.

We also checked whether Mr. Woodford's conviction of minor at age 15 would count toward his criminal history. But because it occurred within the five years prior to his instant offense, it does count.

Mr. Woodford has five criminal history points. And under Chapter 5, Part A of the guidelines he has a criminal history category of three.

The sentencing options are as follows: For the sole count of the Indictment the maximum term of imprisonment is ten years for violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 922(g)(1) and 18 U.S.C. Section 924(a)(2). Based on a total offense level of 26 and the criminal history category of three, the guidelines provide a range of imprisonment between 78 to 97 months. Had the underlying state case for which defendant was arrested in November of 2017 not been dismissed, this federal sentence would have run concurrently with any anticipated term of imprisonment to be imposed in the underlying state criminal case, since the conduct in that case is related to the instant case, under guideline 5G1.3(c). This sentence may also be imposed to run concurrently, partially concurrently or

consecutively to the undischarged term of imprisonment stemming from Mr. Woodford's 2016 state conviction and 2018 state parole revocation violation, guidelines Section 5G1.3(d). If Mr. Woodford were to serve the remainder of his state court sentence, based on PSR paragraph 25, he would be eligible for release in January of 2024.

With regard to supervised release, the Court may impose a term of supervised release of not more than three years under 18 U.S. Code 3583(b)(2). And because this offense is a Class C felony, the guideline range for a term of supervised release is one to three years under guideline 5D1.2(a)(2).

Although restitution is mandatory, unfortunately this victim has not returned an affidavit of loss; therefore, I will not be able to order any restitution for the victim's injuries.

Because the offense is a Class C felony,

Mr. Woodford would be eligible for not less than one nor more
than five years of probation under 18 U.S.C. 3561(c)(1), but I
would have to impose as a condition of probation absent
extraordinary circumstances, a fine, restitution, or community
service, under Section 3563(a)(2).

The applicable guideline range is Zone D of the sentencing table. The defendant is not eligible for probation under 5B1.1, application note two.

The maximum fine that may be imposed is \$250,000 under section 3571(b) of Title 18. The guidelines provide that the fine range would be 25,000 to 250,000 under guideline 5E1.2(c)(3). The Probation Department finds, and I agree, that Mr. Woodford is not able to pay a fine and will not likely become able to pay a fine. So I will not impose a fine.

Under Mr. Woodford's plea agreement, he agreed to forfeit the three Remington-Peters .380 caliber cartridge casings recovered from the crime scene on August 30, 2018.

I've signed a preliminary order of forfeiture on February 18, 2020, that will be incorporated into the judgment.

I must impose a \$100 mandatory special assessment under 18 U.S. Code Section 3013 for the sole count of the Indictment.

I will not impose the cost of prosecution.

One thing I would note is that Mr. Woodford should pay his special assessment as soon as possible through the Bureau of Prisons financial responsibility program so that the Government does not have to expend resources collecting this money. He can pay the assessment of \$100 through his prison program.

Mr. Woodford, you do have the right to appeal your sentence. Under paragraph four of your agreement with the Government, you agreed not to file an appeal or challenge your

sentence if I impose a term of imprisonment of 108 months or below. The Appellate Court will decide if your appellate waiver is enforceable. I will not have that decision. Any appeal must be filed within 14 days of judgment being entered in your case.

If you cannot afford to pay the cost of an appeal, the filing fee, you may apply for leave to do so if you can establish that you're indigent. The clerk of this court at your request -- at Ms. Glashausser' request -- will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

I ask Ms. Glashausser to take all necessary steps to protect her client's right on appeal to file a timely appeal and to have representation. Will you do that, ma'am?

MS. GLASHAUSSER: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Next I ask whether the Government has arranged for any return of property that may have been seized from Mr. Woodford at the time of his arrest so we can avoid other proceedings.

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Your Honor, I'm not aware of the Government possessing any property. But if that's not true, then I can look into that.

THE COURT: Is there anything, Ms. Glashausser?

MS. GLASHAUSSER: No. I suspect that's correct,
because Mr. Woodford was originally arrested by the local

authority.

THE COURT: Thank you.

In determining a sentence in any case I give respectful consideration to the advisory guidelines, which are not mandatory, in addition to the sentencing factors set forth at Title 18 3553(a) one through seven.

First, in determining the sentence I considered the nature and circumstances of Mr. Woodford's offense. And find that his offense is very serious. He did also agree in his agreement that the attempted murder guidelines would apply.

I think there is no doubt watching those videos that as he fired repeatedly at his victim, even while he was on the ground, this was incredibly serious, horrific and chilling.

Mr. Woodford entered a plea of guilty to the sole count of the Indictment, felon in possession of ammunition. The sole count charged that he on August 30, 2018, after previously being convicted in a court of one or more crimes punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding one year, did knowingly and intentionally possess in and affecting commerce three Remington-Peters .380 auto caliber cartridge casings in violation of 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1).

I think the video depicts a muzzle of a firearm and the flash of light coming from the muzzle at various times.

In any event, we talked about the serious nature of firing on the street, in the evening when there were many innocent

bystanders. And the video bears out there was a chase through several city blocks before the victim was shot.

On August 29, 2018, a surveillance camera inside a deli 1990 Bedford Avenue in Brooklyn recorded video of the defendant on the premise along with approximately five other individuals. The video captured a clear image of Mr. Woodford's face and his attire, a short sleeved T-shirt, black and white basketball shorts, and a black Nike logo on the shirt, a white scarf or doo-rag on his head, and red and white Nike sneakers.

The following night, August 30, 2018, at approximately 8:51 p.m. another surveillance camera captured the defendant and four individuals walking in front of a deli at 1844 Nostrand Avenue in Brooklyn. Mr. Woodford was dressed in the attire as the previous night but without a head covering. Though the video did not capture as close a view of the defendant's face as the earlier video, Mr. Woodford's beard and distinct hairline and haircut were still visible. One of the men with Mr. Woodford struck a man standing with others, and Mr. Woodford's group began to case the other men.

A minute later, a surveillance video located at 1356

New York Avenue captured the defendant chasing another man,

who I will refer to as the victim, along a walkway leading to

3104 Newkirk Avenue. Mr. Woodford chased the victim into the

courtyard and shot at him. Video surveillance at 3104 Newkirk

Avenue captured the defendant chasing the victim in the courtyard while continuing to shoot at him.

As Mr. Woodford fired at the victim, three individuals approached from the opposite direction having nothing to do with this dispute, had to duck the shots.

Eventually Mr. Woodford hit the victim and the victim fell to the ground. Mr. Woodford approached the victim and shot him several more times at close range, then ran off and left the victim on the ground.

Police officers arrived minutes after the shooting and secured the crime scene. The victim sustained multiple shots to his left thigh and lower torso and was transported to the hospital. Medical staff were not able to remove all of the bullets from the victim's body. About an hour after the shooting took place, an officer from the NYPD's Evidence Collection Team collected three Remington-Peters .380 caliber cartridge casings from the area where the shooting had taken place.

On September 14, 2018, NYPD officers arrested Mr. Woodford on charges of violating his state parole by committing the August 30, 2018 shooting.

On or about November 21, 2018, FBI agents arrested Mr. Woodford for the instant offense at Rikers Island in Queens, New York.

Sadly, this is not the first time that Mr. Woodford

has used a firearm in the commission of a violent crime. As noted above, in 2016 Mr. Woodford pled guilty to robbery in the second degree.

Now, the use of a firearm, at least in some these robberies, was established at the state court. The weapon turned out to be an imitation pistol. That is of no moment. Mr. Woodford, was sentenced to over a year in custody. And was on release on parole for a few months before he committed the instant offense. A parole violation as well as these federal charges resulted.

I've considered Mr. Woodford's personal characteristics, family history, and circumstances.

Mr. Woodford was born April 16, 2000 in the Bronx to the union of Darell Smith and Lukisha Durant. When Mr. Woodford was only five years old, he witnessed his mother tragically die, from a physical condition, in front of him. After his mother passed, Mr. Woodford moved in with his grandmother and uncle, who according to Mr. Woodford subjected him to physical abuse, including hitting him with belts, slippers, and switches. The Administration for Children's Services, or ACS, eventually intervened and Mr. Woodford moved in with his grandfather in Buffalo, New York. Unfortunately, this transition did not provide Mr. Woodford with a more secure or stable environment.

He recounts that his grandfather abused crack

cocaine and stole defendant's monthly death benefit money from his mother's passing to feed his crack habit.

These there were some positive influences on Mr. Woodford's primitive years. His grandmother, Maxine Middleton, and his aunt, Deanna Woodford, were apparently loving and supportive presences in Mr. Woodford's life. Though his grandmother's attention was limited due to the burdens of working three different jobs to support her extended family, Deanna seems to have embraced the role of Mr. Woodford's parent, being only six years older than Mr. Woodford himself.

Mr. Woodford recalls that Deanna picked him up from school, helped him with his homework, and generally took care of him.

Although Mr. Woodford's childhood could be fairly characterized as traumatic and unstable, he fortunately had two loving presences in his life.

As an adolescent, Mr. Woodford gradually began to skip school and stay out late. He first smoked marijuana at 11 years old, and he reports he smoked an ounce per day up to the date of his arrest in this case. He relates that he picked up his marijuana habit from his father, who he saw smoking the drug at home. Mr. Woodford also ingested Ecstasy on one occasion when he was 17.

When he was 14, one of his friends was stabbed to

death and Mr. Woodford witnessed that. Mr. Woodford began to carry a gun. As his aunt Deanna notes, Mr. Woodford started hanging out with individuals who were bad influences. He had some affiliation, though we are not considering any of his affiliations in his sentences. He disputes that he's affiliated or 8 Trey Cowboy Crips.

Mr. Woodford has four paternal half siblings, all of whom are in good health and reside with their mother in Manhattan. They are young, under the age of ten, and are not aware of Mr. Woodford's current conviction. Mr. Woodford's father is in good health and resides in Queens, New York. He works as a bike messenger and is aware of Mr. Woodford's current prosecution. He remains supportive of his son.

Mr. Woodford has never been married or fathered any children. He's not currently in a relationship.

Mr. Woodford's most recent employment includes working as a maintenance construction labor helper for his grandfather in Buffalo for three months in 2014, working for a summer youth program in Manhattan for three months in 2014. And working at a rapper for two to three months in 2018 for NuLa Entertainment in New Jersey.

Neither Mr. Woodford nor those who wrote letters on his behalf has indicated whether he has specific post-confinement employment prospects, though Deanna Woodford intends to help him apply for jobs generally. His friend

Celaine Jean notes that she and Mr. Woodford plan to open a business together. Mr. Woodford wants to continue his career as a rapper.

Mr. Woodford repeated the 11th grade Brooklyn, but did not complete the school year because he was arrested for the instant offense. While incarcerated at MDC, it appears — and maybe you can correct me, Ms. Glashausser, because you said something different earlier — that Mr. Woodford obtained a GED in math and completed Alternative To Violence training programs and a card making class.

So he completed part of his GED; is that right in math?

MS. GLASHAUSSER: He completed both part of his GED I think previously and took a course at MDC for math, but did not get the chance to take the actual test so that New York state would recognize that he had his math GED. He has done the course work, but they haven't given him the test so he can have the certificate.

THE COURT: I'm hopeful that you'll be able to take the exam. Given your studies and preparation, I'm hoping that you will be able to pass.

Mr. Woodford and his counsel assure the Court that Mr. Woodford has changed for the better during his time at MDC. I believe that he sincerely believes in his change and has taken positive steps to demonstrate that change.

Mr. Woodford has expressed remorse for his actions, wrote to his victim and family for his August 30, 2018, conduct. In his letter he writes: I'm sorry for all the trauma I put the victim, my family, and the innocent bystanders through. It wasn't the right thing to do. I think about it every night before I go to sleep. I think about what I could have done differently and how I shouldn't have done it at all.

Defense counsel's chief paralegal also observes that Mr. Woodford has grown more communicative since his 2018 arrest. She further suggests that the instant offense and its consequences woke him up.

When defense counsel spoke to Mr. Woodford on April 15, Mr. Woodford explained that he is currently driven by a need to care for his family. And acknowledged that he has an important role to play in supporting his family.

I think, Ms. Glashausser, your statement today was very encouraging and moving. I think that Mr. Woodford, you know him best, better than the prosecutor and I do, but has demonstrated significant positive change. So that is encouraging.

Mr. Woodford has requested a below guideline sentence of imprisonment for the sole count. Counsel does not request a specific amount of time. Mr. Woodford argues that I should exercise size discretion and depart from the

recommended guideline sentence because he was only 18 years old at the time of the offense, and because for an entire week last winter at MDC, where he has been held, did not have heat, electricity, light, or hot water exposing Mr. Woodford to abject conditions. In other cases, I have definitely taken this into consideration. I agree with my colleagues and the findings of those who have been to the MDC, that the conditions during the winter black-out were inhumane and resulted in a very harsh detention.

Mr. Woodford lived through more than 13 months of lockdowns at MDC during COVID-19, in which he had limited opportunities to be out of his cell to engage in courses or recreational activities. And he himself contracted COVID-19. He did not have medical treatment during that time. He was on his own. It sounds as if he had a very difficult set of conditions when he was ill.

Mr. Woodford had very little time outside of his cell. He had one social visit and only recently was able to receive legal visits. He was put in isolation after he had tested positive for the virus and he had access only to brown drinking water and received no medical attention.

Despite these conditions Mr. Woodford has maintained his position as an orderly. And I take into account Mr. Woodford's still relatively young age, he's 20 years old at this time.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: Twenty-one.

THE COURT: I take into account the harsh conditions caused by the MDC blackout and what must have been a very challenging and worrisome experience in the past 13 months while ill with Covid, among a global pandemic, and his isolation from the outside world.

The Government urges me to impose a sentence within the 78 to 97 month guideline range, but also notes that I may take into consideration and impose a sentence below the guidelines based on the harsh conditions at MDC. I agree with the Government that this particular offense is not a garden-variety arms possession offense. But rather it appears to be an attempted murder. The video displayed during the pretrial hearing shows that the defendant did pursue his victim and opened fire on him while running after the victim in a public area. In addition, the Government makes a point that despite his youth, this crime is a very serious adult crime. Further, Mr. Woodford agreed to an attempted murder enhancement in the PSR's guideline calculation as part of his plea.

The Government highlights the 2016 robbery conviction as a significant factor in the *Booker* inquiry in two respects. First, the Government argues that

Mr. Woodford's prior conviction on eight counts of robbery in the second degree demonstrates a willingness to repeatedly

engage in serious criminal conduct. Second, the Government contends that Mr. Woodford's sentence by the state court to a period of 28 months to seven years imprisonment to run concurrent on each of the eight robberies was lenient. Rather than using his release on parole in May 29, 2018, to turn from criminal activity and live a law abiding life, the Government maintains that Mr. Woodford's lenient 2017 sentence only emboldened him to engage in further and more serious violent criminal conduct. Given that defendant committed the instant offense a mere three months after his release on parole by state authorities, it is hard to refute the Government's contentions that Mr. Woodford's conduct in this case demonstrated that he had not been deterred specifically and that he lacked respect for the law.

After giving respectful consideration to the advisory guidelines and all of the factors set forth in 18 U.S. Code Section 3553(a), for the reasons explained below, I will impose a sentence that falls slightly below the advisory guideline range on the sole count of the Indictment.

I recognize that Mr. Woodford had a very difficult childhood, one that no child should have in terms of seeing your mother pass before your eyes when you're only five, being beaten by relatives who should be loving and taking care of you, and having a parent who was using drugs illegally in front of him. I take into consideration, as I said before,

the harsh conditions caused by the MDC's blackout in the winter of 2019. As well as the harsh conditions imposed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the fact that Mr. Woodford suffered through the COVID-19 illness himself.

It is difficult for me to reconcile frankly

Mr. Woodford's youth. On the one hand he is bright, he's

motivated, and his life is ahead of him. I agree with his

aunt, this offense doesn't define who he is as a man. He has

potential to become more than this offense, more than his past

offenses. I think he's on a positive path to do that.

Yet, this was an incredibly serious offense. The growth and maturation that is expected as one gains years and experience and wisdom, is one that I take into account. I'm not convinced that the August 30, 2018, shooting was a heat-of-the-moment-type of offense. It might have been triggered by an encounter, but pursuing someone for blocks at a time, firing a gun, is somewhat of a deliberate prolonged and really chilling act. Although Mr. Woodford appears to state was acting in self-defense, that he would have been shot if he hadn't shot the victim, there is nothing before the Court indicating that the victim was armed or acted in an aggressive manner toward Mr. Woodford, at least based on what has been presented in the videos and in the submissions.

It is concerning in terms of deterrence that he was released only three months before from prison and was on a

parole sentence when this federal offense occurred.

Thus, given considerations of the nature of the offense, whether or not my sentence will provide specific and general deterrence, will protect the public including, all those like those depicted in the video, will provide vocational and educational training and mental health treatment, I will impose a sentence on Mr. Woodford that based on all of these factors will provide Mr. Woodford additional time to reflect on his past actions and prepare for his future as a law abiding citizen.

Accordingly, I sentence Mr. Woodford as follows: I sentence him to a sentence of 70 months in custody for the sole of the Indictment to be served concurrently, if the state agrees, with the time remaining on Mr. Woodford's state court sentence for robbery and a parole violation.

I will recommend that Mr. Woodford be placed in Ray Brook so he can avail himself of college prep courses.

Mr. Woodford has been in custody since November 21, 2018, on the federal charge; and therefore, he should receive credit for time served since November 21, 2018. I believe it's approximately 29 months, but I'll leave it to the BOP to calculate time in custody.

Mr. Woodford is urged to take advantage of vocational and educational courses. I hope at the facility where he's designated he'll have the opportunity to sit for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

40

his GED and take college-level courses. I also recommend that he avail himself of substance abuse and mental health treatment to address his traumatic childhood and obvious anger issues and substance abuse.

He's clearly an intelligent young man. He's motivated. He's a gifted musician. And I believe that his life will be different if he commits to living a different life. He should pursue all educational and vocational opportunities and gain further understanding of himself in a path forward.

Mr. Woodford will also be serving a three-year supervised release term with the following conditions: must submit his person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers and computers as defined by 18 U.S. Code 1030(e)(1) and other electronic communications or data storage devices or media or office to a search conducted by a United States Probation Officer. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revoking his supervised release. Mr. Woodford shall advise any other occupants who share a premise with him that it may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. A Probation Officer may conduct a search under this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that Mr. Woodford has violated the condition of his supervision and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation. Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable

manner.

Mr. Woodford shall not associate, in-person, through the mail, telephone, or electronic communication directly or indirectly with any individual with an affiliation with any organized crime group, gang, or other criminal enterprise, pursuant but not limited to, a prohibition list that the Government shall provide to U.S. probation. Nor shall Mr. Woodford frequent any place or establishment identified by U.S. probation and the Government as a location where such persons or group may meet.

Mr. Woodford shall maintain full-time employment and when not employed full time, he should continue with educational and vocational training.

Mr. Woodford shall submit to regular mental health treatment for anger management and other mental health challenges and also to drug testing and treatment. The cost of such testing and treatment for substance abuse and mental health shall be borne by Mr. Woodford to the extent he's able to pay based on the Probation Department's sliding scale. He must give truthful financial information to the Probation Department so they can assess his ability to pay.

Although there is a victim, as we know, who would be entitled to restitution, that victim has not come forward.

And, therefore, I will not impose victim restitution despite the fact that it is mandated.

Mr. Woodford's forfeiture has been effected by the Government. The forfeiture order will be appended to this judgment and incorporated, but it will be noted that it's been finalized.

Is that correct, Mr. Aganga-Williams?

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: I'm not quite sure about that

but I'll look into it.

THE COURT: Do you want me to append it to the judgment?

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Yes, that would be great.

THE COURT: Okay. I will not impose a fine given Mr. Woodford's inability to pay a fine.

And in addition, sir, you must pay the \$100 mandatory special assessment.

I do wish you well, sir. I understand that this offense, as serious as it was, is not who you are. I wish you well in moving forward in a positive direction with your life, which looks like, given your youth, is long and promising. So good luck to you.

Is there anything else to address?

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: If I may. On the condition regarding affiliating with known gang members or locations where gang members might be. Based on the time that Mr. Woodford is going to serve incarcerated and the three years of supervised release, I wonder whether the term

condition can read: As to individuals that he understands to be affiliated with gangs and locations. Just because, practically speaking, if the FBI would provide a list of individuals today that list several years from now might be irrelevant.

THE COURT: I don't want to leave it up to

Mr. Woodford to define who is in a gang and who is not. I

think the Government has resources to determine which gangs we
need to advise Mr. Woodford to stay away from and which

locations. I understand your point, that he has several years

left on his sentence, but in several years when he's released

you can provide that list based on the Government's current

knowledge about gangs or organized crime groups or locales.

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: That is true, your Honor. The limitation the Government has is — from the Government's view, Mr. Woodford is a member of a gang. The Government has an understanding of the composition of the gang, but if Mr. Woodford subjectively and the Government of course through a violation have to meet a burden of proof would be affiliated with a gang member someone the Government did not know was a gang member, the Government is a disadvantage in knowing those facts, that sphere would be captured by your Honor's condition. Mr. Woodford could be affiliated with someone who he nose to be in a gang, but the Government for whatever reason does not, has not become aware, which will always be

the fact. There are numerous people, even this specific gang, the Government may not be aware that they are in the gang because the Government is not privy to all that information.

THE COURT: Well, the language says that he shall not affiliate with any organized crime group, gang or other criminal enterprise pursuant but not limited to the prohibition list. I think that cover it is.

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: That does cover it. I was just confirming.

THE COURT: Okay, so I understand there is knowledge on the Government's part that it may be stale by the time he's released. Giving him credit for the time that he already served, and the 70 months is with credit for time served since November 21, 2018, which is the date he was in federal custody. So 70 months less almost 29 months, plus hopefully good time behavior, it may be that the time left on his sentence it won't be that far in the future is what I'm saying.

MR. AGANGA-WILLIAMS: Understood, Judge. Thank you.

MS. GLASHAUSSER: Can I just respond to that briefly
so we're clear about that position?

I do think as your Honor wrote is one that is clear so Mr. Woodford knows what he can and cannot do. Obviously, Mr. Woodford disagrees that he's in the gang. To have the list would be appropriate so the condition is not too vague to